

Gluon Spin in a Quark Model

V. Barone^{a,1}, T. Calarco^b and A. Drago^b

^a*Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Torino
and INFN, Sezione di Torino, 10125 Torino, Italy*

^b*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Ferrara
and INFN, Sezione di Ferrara, 44100 Ferrara, Italy*

Abstract

We compute the gluon polarization ΔG and the gluon total angular momentum J_g in the Isgur–Karl quark model. Taking into account self-interaction contributions, we obtain for both quantities a positive value of about 0.24 at the model scale $\mu_0^2 \simeq 0.25$ GeV². This estimate is reasonably close to the expectation from polarized deep inelastic scattering analyses.

PACS: 13.88.+e, 14.70.Dj, 12.38.Bx, 12.39.Jh

¹Also at II Facoltà di Scienze MFN, 15100 Alessandria, Italy.

The EMC spin effect, *i.e.* the discovery that a surprisingly small fraction of the proton spin is carried by quarks, has been a major issue of hadronic physics for quite a long time by now [1]. In the naive quark model one expects that quarks carry all proton's spin, that is $\Delta\Sigma \equiv \int dx (\Delta u + \Delta d + \Delta s) \simeq 1$. Taking into account relativistic effects this value is typically lowered to about $0.7 - 0.8$, still much larger than the experimental finding for the singlet axial charge [2]. This discrepancy is what has been termed “the proton spin crisis”. The solution of the puzzle is known [3]. Due to the axial anomaly, the singlet axial charge, which is the experimentally measured quantity, is not simply $\Delta\Sigma$ but the combination $a_0 = \Delta\Sigma - (N_f \alpha_s / 2\pi) \Delta G$, where ΔG is the gluon helicity. A small value of a_0 (~ 0.3) is thus compatible with a relatively large value of $\Delta\Sigma$ if one allows for a sizeable ΔG . It has been shown [4] that the experimental data suggest $\Delta G = 1.6 \pm 0.9$ at $Q^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$. The question arises whether a realistic model of the proton – or any non perturbative calculation – can predict a gluon polarization of such an order of magnitude.

The situation is rather controversial. In [5] Jaffe gave a negative answer to the question: he found $\Delta G \sim -0.4$ in the MIT bag model at a scale $\mu_0^2 \simeq 0.25 \text{ GeV}^2$ and an even more negative value (~ -0.7) in the non-relativistic quark model. On the contrary, a recent QCD sum rule calculation [6] gives $\Delta G \simeq 2.1 \pm 1.0$ at 1 GeV^2 . Hence two different non perturbative approaches seem to give contrasting results. Another open issue [7] is the relative weight of ΔG and J_g , the gluon total angular momentum, or – otherwise stated – the sign and the size of the gluon orbital angular momentum L_g .

The purpose of this Letter is to clarify these problems. We shall show that: *i)* the negative value for ΔG obtained by Jaffe is a consequence of neglecting “self-angular momentum” effects; *ii)* the quark model is not incompatible with a positive and sizeable gluon polarization; *iii)* a specific calculation leads to a value of ΔG which is not far from what is required by the polarized DIS data and from what is obtained in the QCD sum rule computations; *iv)* J_g is close to ΔG at the model scale, and its value is in good agreement with the finding of Ref. [7].

In practical calculations we shall use the Isgur–Karl (IK) model [8], which is suffi-

cient for our purposes. We do not aim in fact at a precision calculation, but only at a qualitative study and an order-of-magnitude estimate. Moreover, the possibility to carry out analytically the calculations allows for a better control of the result. Our main conclusions would be unchanged should we use more sophisticated models of the nucleon.

The angular momentum sum rule for the nucleon reads [9, 10]

$$\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Sigma(Q^2) + L_q(Q^2) + J_g(Q^2) \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta\Sigma$ is the quark spin, L_q the quark orbital angular momentum and J_g is the total angular momentum carried by the glue. All quantities on the r.h.s. of eq. (1) are gauge invariant and depend in general on a scale μ^2 [9, 10]. We shall be concerned with the gluonic term in eq. (1), which is given by

$$J_g(\mu^2) = \langle p \uparrow | \int d^3r \left[\vec{r} \times \left(\vec{E}(\vec{r}) \times \vec{B}(\vec{r}) \right) \right]^3 | p \uparrow \rangle. \quad (2)$$

J_g cannot be decomposed in a gauge invariant manner into an orbital (L_g) and a spin (ΔG) part written in terms of local fields. Nevertheless in the $\mathcal{A}^+ = 0$ gauge it is possible to give a local expression for the gluon in terms of the color fields [5]

$$\Delta G(\mu^2) = \langle p \uparrow | \int d^3r 2 \text{Tr} \left\{ \left[\vec{E}(\vec{r}) \times \vec{A}(\vec{r}) \right]^3 + \vec{A}_\perp(\vec{r}) \cdot \vec{B}_\perp(\vec{r}) \right\} | p \uparrow \rangle. \quad (3)$$

The renormalization of the operators appearing in eqs. (2, 3) induces a scale dependence of J_g and ΔG . However, in a quark model the matrix elements in eqs. (2, 3) do not depend on any scale. The model describes the nucleon at a fixed scale, which is usually very low ($\lesssim 0.5 \text{ GeV}^2$).

The color fields generated by the quarks are ($a = 1, \dots, 8$)

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{E}(\vec{r}) &= \sum_{a=1}^8 \vec{E}^a(\vec{r}) = -\vec{\nabla} \sum_{a=1}^8 \Phi^a(\vec{r}) ; \\ \vec{B}(\vec{r}) &= \sum_{a=1}^8 \vec{B}^a(\vec{r}) = \vec{\nabla} \times \sum_{a=1}^8 \vec{A}^a(\vec{r}) , \end{aligned}$$

where the potentials

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^a(\vec{r}) &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\lambda_i^a}{2} \int d^3r' \frac{\rho_i(\vec{r}')}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} ; \\ \vec{A}^a(\vec{r}) &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\lambda_i^a}{2} \int d^3r' \frac{\vec{j}_i(\vec{r}')}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} \end{aligned}$$

are written in terms of the single-quark charge densities

$$\rho_i(\vec{r}) = g \delta^3(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i) \quad (4)$$

and current densities ($c = \text{convective}$, $m = \text{magnetic}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{j}_i(\vec{r}) &= \vec{j}_i^c(\vec{r}) + \vec{j}_i^m(\vec{r}) \\ \vec{j}_i^c(\vec{r}) &= -\frac{ig}{2m} \left[\vec{\nabla}_{\vec{r}_i} \delta^3(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i) + \delta^3(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i) \vec{\nabla}_{\vec{r}_i} \right] \\ \vec{j}_i^m(\vec{r}) &= \frac{g}{4m} \vec{\nabla}_{\vec{r}} \times \left[\vec{\sigma}_i \delta^3(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The expressions above are written in the non relativistic form, in view of their use in the IK model.

We now make a gauge transformation to new potentials $\mathcal{A}^\mu$, enforcing the condition $\mathcal{A}^+ = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{0a}(\vec{r}) &= \Phi^a(\vec{r}), \\ \vec{\mathcal{A}}^a(\vec{r}) &= \vec{A}^a(\vec{r}) - \vec{\nabla} \int_0^z d\zeta \Phi^a(x, y, \zeta). \end{aligned}$$

Eqs. (2, 3) become

$$J_g(\mu^2) = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^8 \int d^3r \left[\vec{r} \times \langle p \uparrow | \left(\vec{E}_i^a(\vec{r}) \times \vec{B}_j^a(\vec{r}) \right) | p \uparrow \rangle \right]^3, \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta G(\mu^2) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^8 \int d^3r \langle p \uparrow | \left\{ \left[\vec{E}_i^a(\vec{r}) \times \vec{A}_j^a(\vec{r}) \right]^3 + \left[\vec{E}_i^a(\vec{r}) \times \vec{\nabla} f_j^a(\vec{r}) \right]^3 + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \vec{A}_{\perp i}^a(\vec{r}) \cdot \vec{B}_{\perp j}^a(\vec{r}) + \vec{\nabla}_{\perp} f_i^a(\vec{r}) \cdot \vec{B}_{\perp j}^a(\vec{r}) \right\} | p \uparrow \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $f^a(\vec{r}) \equiv \int_0^z d\zeta \Phi^a(x, y, \zeta)$.

Upon integration by parts, the second term in eq. (6) vanishes, whereas the fourth term equals the first one plus a surface integral, which also vanishes in the model at hand.

Setting $\vec{E}_i^a \equiv \frac{\lambda_i^a}{2} \vec{E}^i$, and analogous relations for $\vec{A}_i^a, \vec{B}_i^a$, and denoting by $\langle \cdot \rangle_c, \langle \cdot \rangle_{\text{osf}}$ the color and orbital-spin-flavor expectation values, respectively, we get

$$J_g(\mu^2) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^8 \langle \lambda_i^a \lambda_j^a \rangle_c \int d^3r \left[\vec{r} \times \langle p \uparrow | \vec{E}_i(\vec{r}) \times \vec{B}_j(\vec{r}) | p \uparrow \rangle_{\text{osf}} \right]^3, \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta G(\mu^2) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^8 \langle \lambda_i^a \lambda_j^a \rangle_c \int d^3r \langle p \uparrow | \left\{ 2 [\vec{E}_i(\vec{r}) \times \vec{A}_j(\vec{r})]^3 + \vec{A}_{\perp i}(\vec{r}) \cdot \vec{B}_{\perp j}(\vec{r}) \right\} | p \uparrow \rangle_{\text{osf}}. \quad (8)$$

An explicit model calculation of eqs. (7, 8) requires some approximation. For instance, one can replace the color fields by their expectation values in the nucleon eigenstate. In this case, if one includes the self-interaction terms with $i = j$, J_g and ΔG turn out to be exactly zero. The reason for this is simple. Since the ground state of the nucleon is symmetric with respect to the exchange of any pair of quarks, the matrix elements in the integrals of eqs. (7, 8) do not depend on the particle indices i and j . Thus the integrals factorize out and J_g and ΔG vanish exactly because $\sum_{i,j} \sum_a \langle \lambda_i^a \lambda_j^a \rangle = 0$. In [5] the self-interaction terms are neglected since they could diverge and therefore require to be renormalized. The result is a negative ΔG , which is a direct consequence of $\sum_a \lambda_i^a \lambda_j^a = -8/3$ for $i \neq j$.

In our calculation of eqs. (7, 8) we will include also the self-interaction contributions. Let us consider for definiteness ΔG (the calculation of J_g proceeds in a similar way). We insert in the matrix element of eq. (8) a complete set of intermediate states $|\beta\rangle$, which include the orbital excitations of the three-quark system. In our non-relativistic calculation only positive energy states will appear. The matrix elements

$$\langle 0 | \vec{E}_i(\vec{r}) | \beta \rangle, \quad \langle \beta | \vec{A}_j(\vec{r}) | 0 \rangle \quad (9)$$

for states $|\beta\rangle$ with orbital mixed symmetry now carry a non trivial dependence on the particle index. As a consequence, the integral in eq. (8) no longer factorizes out and ΔG is not forced to vanish, even including the self-field terms. The procedure outlined above corresponds to taking into account static contributions to the self-spin and is equivalent to introducing a time-independent Green function for the quarks, expanded on the modes of the model Hamiltonian.

Eq. (8) then reads (we omit the second term which turns out to be zero)

$$\Delta G(\mu^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^8 \sum_{\beta} \langle \lambda_i^a \cdot \lambda_j^a \rangle_c \int d^3r \left[\langle p \uparrow | \vec{E}_i(\vec{r}) | \beta \rangle \times \langle \beta | \vec{A}_j(\vec{r}) | p \uparrow \rangle_{\text{osf}} \right]^3. \quad (10)$$

Since the color electric field does not contain any spin-flavor operator, the intermediate states $|\beta\rangle$ must have the same spin-flavor structure as the proton. Moreover, the totally

symmetric or antisymmetric intermediate states give again (i, j) -independent matrix elements and therefore a vanishing contribution to eq. (10).

Before showing our results, we need to discuss the convergence of the series obtained in the mode expansion. The latter is expected to be at worst logarithmically divergent, as it happens in QED for an isolated electron [5]. Thus, in principle renormalization is required. On the other hand our calculation is performed in a non-relativistic effective model, which is supposed to be valid up to excitation energies of the order of few GeV at most. For larger energies relativistic corrections should be included. The situation here is rather similar to the one presented in the classical paper of Bethe on the Lamb shift [11]. In that case a natural cut-off was introduced and assumed to be equal to the electron mass. Higher energy contributions were left to be computed using a relativistic approach and renormalizing. Since the divergence was a logarithmical one, the precise value of the cutoff was irrelevant and a very good estimate of the energy shift was obtained. Here we adopt the same procedure, taking into account excited states having energies up to ~ 1 GeV above the ground state.

We calculated analytically the contributions to ΔG and J_g using the IK wavefunctions [8]. The parameters of the model are fixed so as to reproduce the hadronic spectroscopy [8]. The results are shown in Tab. 1, where the contributions are labelled by the energy quantum number $\mathcal{N}$ and by the orbital angular momentum $\mathcal{L}$ of the excited states. They are also classified according to the symmetry of the wavefunctions with respect to the exchange of quark pairs. Notice that only the states with mixed symmetry give a non vanishing contribution, as we anticipated above.

The resulting estimates for ΔG and J_g are given by the sum of the contributions in the last two columns of Tab. 1. Only the first three energy levels are presented in the table. For ΔG we pushed the calculation up to the states with $\mathcal{N} = 3$ and we found $0.03 \alpha_s$. The apparently stronger convergence of the J_g expansion can perhaps be related to its gauge-invariant expression. On the contrary, ΔG is in general non-local and the local expression here adopted is obtained choosing a particular gauge. It would be interesting to ascertain if, using directly the non-local expression which introduces a natural cut-off, the expansion do converge.

The values of J_g and ΔG have been expressed so far in terms of the strong coupling constant α_s , which is fixed in the IK model by reproducing the $\Delta - N$ mass splitting. This gives $\alpha_s = 0.9$ [8], which corresponds to a model scale $\mu_0^2 \simeq 0.25 \text{ GeV}^2$. The dynamical quantities computed in the model are implicitly taken at this scale.

We can now present our final estimate

$$J_g(\mu_0^2) \simeq \Delta G(\mu_0^2) \simeq 0.24, \quad \mu_0^2 = 0.25 \text{ GeV}^2.$$

Thus, at the model scale, very little room (if any) is left for the orbital angular momentum of gluons: $L_g(\mu_0^2) \simeq 0$.

In order to see what happens at a larger scale, we perform a leading-order (LO) QCD evolution. This is of course a dangerous thing to do when the initial scale is very low, as in our case. However, the evolution of J_g is known only at LO [10, 12], and we content ourselves with a semiquantitative result. J_g and ΔG evolve differently [10]. At LO the quantity $\alpha_s \Delta G$ is constant, whereas J_g increases slowly, its asymptotic value being $8/(16 + 3N_f) = 0.32$. We find

$$\Delta G(5 \text{ GeV}^2) = 0.70, \quad J_g(5 \text{ GeV}^2) = 0.31. \quad (11)$$

Hence, as Q^2 gets larger, the gluon orbital angular momentum L_g becomes negative and increases in absolute value. This scenario is similar to the one suggested by the QCD sum rule calculation of Ref. [7]. Of course, a consistent check of the angular momentum sum rule, eq. (1), requires $\Delta \Sigma$ to be calculated in the presence of polarized glue. This calculation is in progress and will be reported in a future work.

In conclusion, let us summarize our results. We showed that the quark model does not imply a negative gluon helicity, which would contradict the indications coming from polarized DIS data. In a non relativistic model, taking into account self-interaction contributions, we obtained a value of ΔG which is positive and close to the range of values prescribed by the phenomenological analyses of data. Finally, we estimated J_g and found that it is almost equal to ΔG at the model scale.

It is a pleasure to thank Z. Berezhiani, L. Caneschi, R. Cenni and U. Tambini for many useful discussions.

References

- [1] For a review, see: M. Anselmino, A. Efremov, E. Leader, Phys. Rep. 261 (1995) 1.
- [2] See, for instance, D. Adams et al. (SMC), Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 5330.
- [3] G. Altarelli and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B 212 (1988) 391. A.V. Efremov and O.V. Teryaev, JINR report E2-88-287 (1988). R.D. Carlitz, J.C. Collins and A.H. Mueller, Phys. Lett. B 214 (1988) 229.
- [4] R.D. Ball, S. Forte and G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. B 444 (1995) 287; Phys. Lett. B 378 (1996) 255.
- [5] R.L. Jaffe, Phys. Lett. B 365 (1996) 359.
- [6] L. Mankiewicz, G. Piller, A. Saalfeld, Phys. Lett. B 395 (1997) 318.
- [7] I. Balitsky and X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 1225.
- [8] N. Isgur and G. Karl, Phys. Rev. D 18 (1978) 4187; Phys. Rev. D 19 (1979) 2653. M. Brack and R.K. Bhaduri, Phys. Rev. D 35 (1987) 3451.
- [9] P.G. Ratcliffe, Phys. Lett. B 192 (1987) 180.
- [10] X. Ji, J. Tang and P. Hoodbhoy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 (1996) 740.
- [11] H. A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. 72 (1947) 339.
- [12] X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 (1997) 610.

$\mathcal{N}$	$\mathcal{L}$	SYM	ΔG	J_g
0	0	S	0	0
1	1	M	$0.14 \alpha_s$	$0.24 \alpha_s$
2	0	S	0	0
2	0	M	$0.08 \alpha_s$	$0.02 \alpha_s$
2	1	A	0	0
2	2	S	0	0
2	2	M	$0.01 \alpha_s$	$\sim 0.00 \alpha_s$

Table 1: Contributions to ΔG [eq. (10)] and to J_g from different intermediate states $|\beta\rangle$. These are classified according to their energy and orbital angular momentum numbers, and their symmetry under quark pair exchange.